

Excerpts from Deposition of Deirdre Reed

Exhibit 181

Alderson®

COURT REPORTING

Transcript of **Deirdre Reed**

Thursday, January 25, 2018

ACLR v. The United States

Alderson Court Reporting
1-800-FOR-DEPO (367-9976)
Info@AldersonReporting.com
www.AldersonReporting.com

Alderson Reference Number: 75883

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT
OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

- - - - - X
ACLR, LLC, :
Plaintiff, :
: Civil Action No.
-vs- : 15-767 and 16-309
:
THE UNITED STATES :
Defendant. :
- - - - - X

Deposition of DEIRDRE REED, taken
pursuant to Notice of Deposition, at the
office of Reed & Associates, CPAs, 6 Main
Street, Centerbrook, Connecticut, before
Deborah Beausoleil, a Notary Public in and
for the State of Connecticut, on Thursday,
January 25, 2018, at 10:30 a.m.

1 should be eliminated to limit the identification of
2 false positives."

3 Q Now I am back to page 14 on the portion we
4 were looking at previously.

5 You stated that the potential duplicates are
6 often not supported by the documentation; is that
7 correct?

8 A Are often supported as not being duplicate.
9 Not is not supported, no. It's the opposite
10 statement.

11 Q Often supported as not being duplicate?

12 A Correct.

13 Q Was this determination based on your
14 experience with the Part D program?

15 A Yes, in performing the one-third audits.

16 Q And how does it relate to the one-third
17 audits?

18 A Using a portion of the ACLR methodology,
19 which is the UEP methodology, we would identify
20 potential duplicates, present those to the plan
21 sponsor; they would provide supporting documentation
22 that we would review and determine that, in fact,
23 they were not duplicates based on that documentation.

24 Q In your opinion, the UEP would not be a
25 proper audit methodology to determine duplicate